

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_121072
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of different nitrogen regimes through Azadirachta indica (neem) coated urea and calcium sprays on post harvest attributes of peach[Prunus persica (L.) Batsch]
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	With this study, which examines the changes in shelf life after harvest in the Red June peach variety, the effect and difference of different urea and calcium leaf applications have been clearly revealed.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is appropriate, in which form it may be more accurate to give Nitrogen and Calcium in the title.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	YES	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	YES	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This study has been prepared and evaluated according to the background of a scientific article.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	YES	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The text of the study should be corrected in terms of English, some words with ligatures or missing letters are included.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mehmet Ulaş
Department, University & Country	Olive Research Institute, Turkey